



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/380,250	08/30/1999	CHRISTIAN BAILLIF	6206	2378

7590

02/02/2004

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 1500
McLean, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER

VO, LILIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

8

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/380,250

Applicant(s)

BAILLIF ET AL.

Examiner

Lilian Vo

Art Unit

2127

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 - 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 - 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13 – 30 are pending. Claims 1 – 12 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 13 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. **Claims 13 and 16** recite the limitation "the consistency" in page 3, line 6 (claim 13) and line 2 (claim 16). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. **Claims 15 and 20** recite the limitation "the active configuration file" in page 3, line 2 and page 4, line 2, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. **Claim 17** recites the limitations "the log" and "the script" in page 4, lines 3 - 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2127

7. **Claim 21** recites the limitations "the start", "the retrieval" and "the consistency" in page 4, lines 3 - 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. **Claim 22** recites the limitations "the current" and "the user", in page 5, line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. **Claim 23** recites the limitations "the next" and "the listener" in page 5, line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. **Claims 24 - 30** recite the limitations "the name", "the logical", "the identification", "the address", and "the access path", in page 5 - 6, lines 3 - 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 13 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted prior art in view of Boukobza et al. (US 6,122,664, hereinafter Boukobza).

13. Regarding **claim 13**, applicants' admitted prior art teaches the process for assisting in the administration of a distributed application of a transaction processing manager, based on a binary configuration file (TUXCONFIG), characterized in that said process comprises:

retrieving information related to said distributed application in a configuration file of a master machine (Mm) (specification page 1, lines 19 – 30), and

checking the consistency of said application running on a given machine (specification page 2, lines 1 – 9).

However, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the process is automated which performed by a computer program. Boukobza teaches the process for monitoring a plurality of objects types such as Tuxedo applications of a plurality of nodes from a management node in a data processing system by distributing configured agents (abstract, col. 2, lines 39 – 65, col. 4, lines 5 – 15, col. 5, lines 2 – 13).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of applicants' admitted prior art to Boukobza to efficiently monitor the operation of one or more applications in a plurality nodes with global visibility from the management node (col. 2, lines 13 – 20, col. 3, lines 40 – 47, col. 6, lines 36 - 52).

14. Regarding **claim 14**, applicants' admitted prior art teaches that a listener module is required in each machine when the application is distributed and it manages messages and receives information coming from other machines (specification page 2, lines 15 –

Art Unit: 2127

20). Applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the listener module in each machine is being managing by a program from another machine. Nevertheless, Boukobza teaches the distributed applications to each node (or machine) can be monitored and controlled from the management node by installing autonomous agent (col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, lines 17 and fig. 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of applicants' admitted prior art to Boukobza to ease up the administering process by enabling the management node (machine) to monitor and control the distributed applications in each node (machine) with a program.

15. Regarding **claim 15**, applicants' admitted prior art teaches the step for extracting directly from the active configuration file of the master machine information related to the distributed application (specification page 1, lines 19 – 30 and fig. 8).

16. Regarding **claim 16**, applicants' admitted prior art further teaches the step for checking the consistency of said application consists of comparing the information obtained from the configuration file of the master machine and the information obtained from said current application running on a given machine (specification page 2, lines 1 – 9).

17. Regarding **claim 17**, applicants' admitted prior art teaches the administration of listener modules consists of starting and stopping at least one listener module, displaying

Art Unit: 2127

information related to at least one listener module, changing the log of at least one listener module, checking the script of at least one listener module and/or updating the script of at least one listener module (specification page 3, line 5 – page 4, line 9).

18. Regarding **claim 18**, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the step for starting and stopping a listener module running on a first machine is being carried out by an administrator using a second machine distinct from first machine, but belonging to the same network as the first machine. Nevertheless, Boukobza shows the step of starting and stopping of monitoring process on the machines that are controlled by the management node (col. 5, lines 9 – 17).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of applicants' admitted prior art with Boukobza to enable an administrator performs the start and the stop monitoring process on each machine from the management node (machine) so that software distributing can be administered more efficiently.

19. Regarding **claim 19**, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach a step for simultaneously activating several listener modules. Nevertheless, Boukobza shows the step of starting and stopping of monitoring process on the machines that are controlled by the management node (col. 5, lines 9 – 17, col. 6. lines 15 - 20).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of applicants' admitted prior art with

Art Unit: 2127

Boukobza to start the monitoring process on each machine more efficiently with a program running from the management node.

20. Regarding **claim 20**, applicants' admitted prior art further teaches a step for decompiling the active configuration file of the master machine (specification page 1, line 19 – page 2, line 9).

21. Regarding **claim 21**, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the additional limitations as claimed. Nevertheless, Boukobza teaches a graphical interface comprising at least one icon and at least one menu, a dialog box for implementing the start and stop of a listener module and the retrieval of information and checking the consistency of the application running on a given machine (abstract, col. 2, lines 21 – 38, col. 3, line 60 - col. 4, line 4, line 34 – col. 5, line 17, col. 12, lines 12 - 17).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of applicants' admitted prior art with Boukobza so that management and communication between distributed nodes can be more efficient.

22. Regarding **claim 22**, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the additional limitations as claimed. Nevertheless, Boukobza teaches the menu of the graphical interface are structured in tree form (col. 35, lines 2 – 23), and the activation of a menu results in a display of a list of values of the current configuration, selectable by the user (col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 4, line 35 – col. 5, line 17, col. 7, lines 38 - 49).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine applicants' admitted prior art with Boukobza so that management and communication between distributed nodes can be more efficient.

23. Regarding **claim 23**, applicants' admitted prior art teaches a file containing information about the application running on a given machine in order to be able to use it during the next startup of the listener modules (specification page 3, line 18 – page 4, line 9), except the step for automatically generating the information file of the application when the file does not exist in a given machine. Nevertheless, Boukobza teaches the step for automatically generating a log file if there is not one already (col. 26, lines 6 – 25, col. 5, lines 2 - 9).).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of applicants' admitted prior art to Boukobza to better assist the administration process with having the history of the application running retains in the generated logfile.

24. Regarding **claims 24 - 30**, applicants' admitted prior art did not teach the additional limitations as claimed. Nevertheless, Boukobza teaches the information related to at least one listener module is displayed and comprises at least the name of the application (abstract, col. 2, lines 55 – 65, col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 4, lines 36 – 63, col. 16, lines 45 - 48), the logical name of the machine on which the application is run (col. 2, lines 55 – 65, col. 7, lines 38 – 58, col. 16, line 66 – col. 17, line3), the identification of the user (col. 8, lines 33 – 37), the address used by the listener module

Art Unit: 2127

(col. 3, lines 30 – 39, col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, line - 17), the access path to the network (col. 34, lines 43 – 51), and the access path to the log file of the listener module (col. 26, lines 8 – 25).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of applicants' admitted prior art with Boukobza so that management and communication between distributed nodes can be more efficient.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicants' amendments filed on 11/14/03 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground rejection.

Conclusion

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2127

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is 703-305-7864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Lilian Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

lv
January 24, 2004


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100